Distributed Nash Equilibrium Seeking by A Consensus Based Approach

Maojiao Ye, *Student Member, IEEE* and Guoqiang Hu, *Member, IEEE*

arXiv:1602.00771v2 [math.OC] 16 Mar 2016

***Abstract*—In this paper, Nash equilibrium seeking among a network of players is considered. Different from most of the existing works on Nash equilibrium seeking, the players considered in this paper cannot observe their opponents' actions. Instead, the players are supposed to be capable of communicating with their neighbors on their estimated actions under an undirected and connected communication graph. By employing a dynamic consensus protocol, distributed Nash seeking strategies are proposed for general non-cooperative games and quadratic games, respectively. Singular perturbation is leveraged for the analysis of games with non-quadratic payoffs and a local convergence result is derived as multiple isolated Nash equilibria may coexist in the game. For quadratic games, it is shown that the proposed method enables the players' actions to converge to the Nash equilibrium globally. A numerical example is provided to verify the effectiveness of the proposed method.**

***Index Terms*—Nash equilibrium; distributed Nash seeking; strategy-proof; dynamic consensus**

I. INTRODUCTION

The past decade witnessed the penetration of game theory into various research fields including biology, economy, computer science, just to name a few. Along with the development of game theory, Nash seeking in non-cooperative games emerges to be of both theoretical significance and practical relevance (e.g., see [1]-[15] and the references therein).

The authors in [2] formulated pure strategy Nash equilibria seeking as a mixed-integer linear programming problem for pool-based electricity market. Iterative steepest descent was leveraged for finding differential Nash equilibria in continuous games in [3]. Policy evaluation and policy improvement were used for the computation of the Nash equilibrium in differential graphical games [4]. The discrete-time stochastic algorithm developed in [5] allows the players to take actions in both simultaneous and asynchronous fashions. Based on state-based potential games, the authors in [6] considered game design for distributed optimization and convergence to the equilibrium was attained by a distributed process. By using the saddle point dynamics, convergence to the Nash equilibria of a two-network zero-sum games was provided in [7]. Switching communications were considered for the zero-sum games in [8]. Nash equilibrium seeking in generalized convex games was considered in [9]-[11]. The authors in [9] and [10] solved the generalized convex game by a discrete-time distributed algorithm and Lemke's method was adapted for the computation of generalized Nash equilibrium in convex games with quadratic payoffs subject to linear constraints in [11]. Besides, extremum seeking based approaches were proposed to seek for the Nash equilibrium (e.g., see [1] and [12]-[15]). These methods vary from integrator-type extremum seeking [1], discrete-time extremum seeking [12], stochastic extremum seeking [12], [13], Shahshahani gradient-like extremum seeking [14], to Lie bracket approximation based extremum seeking [15], etc. A common characteristic of these methods is that no explicit model information is required for the implementation of the methods.

In non-cooperative games, the players' payoff functions are determined by the players' own actions together with the other players' actions. Hence, a body of the existing works require the players' observation over their opponents' actions to search for the Nash equilibrium. However, full communication is impractical in many engineering systems (e.g., multi-agent systems, ad hoc networks) [16]. This limitation motivates us to consider Nash seeking under local communication network, i.e., the players communicate with their neighbors only. Since the information is exchanged among the players, we consider the problem under the assumption that the players are truthful. Being truthful is a dominant strategy for the players in games that are strategy-proof, i.e., the players have no incentive to report fake data to their opponents. For example, in [17], the authors considered peak-to-average ratio minimization and energy cost minimization in smart grids. The designed game ensures that any untruthful announcement of a player's action increases its own cost thus preventing the players from being untruthful. Strategy-proof can be ensured by using mechanism design (e.g., Vickrey-Clarke-Groves (VCG) mechanism in [18]). However, mechanism design is beyond the scope of the paper and we focus on the development of Nash equilibrium seeking strategies for games with incomplete information under the assumption that the players are truthful.

Related works: Nash seeking for repeated matrix game with limited information was considered in [21]. In [19], the authors considered Nash seeking for aggregative games on graph where each player' payoff function depends on their own actions and an aggregate of all the players' actions. A discrete-time gossip algorithm was proposed to solve it. A similar problem was addressed in [20] for the energy consumption game in the smart grid. The continuous-time method in [20] is based on a dynamic average consensus protocol and the primal-dual dynamics. The idea on solving games without using full information from all the players was then generalized in [16] where the players' payoff functions are coupled in a more general manner. The Nash equilibrium was characterized by a variational inequality. A gossip-based algorithm equipped with a waking clock was proposed. Nevertheless, the players can only update their actions asynchronously to reach the Nash equilibrium. Furthermore, only one player is allowed to share

M. Ye and G. Hu are with the School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Nanyang Technological University, 639798, Singapore (Email: mjye@ntu.edu.sg,gqhu@ntu.edu.sg).

This work was supported by Singapore Economic Development Board under EIRP grant S14-1172-NRF EIRP-IHL.

information in each time interval thus limiting the convergence rate. An almost surely convergence to the Nash equilibrium was presented. Different from [16], we consider the Nash seeking problem in a deterministic and continuous-time scenario. The continuous-time algorithm activates the powerful analysis tools in control theory to solve games. Furthermore, the players can update their actions simultaneously.

Compared with the existing works, the contributions of the paper are summarized as follows.

1) Nash equilibrium seeking for non-cooperative games where the players have no access to the other players' actions is considered in this paper. Based on a dynamic consensus protocol, Nash equilibrium seeking strategies are designed. In the proposed algorithm, the players only need to communicate with their neighbors on some estimated values. Avoiding full communication among the players broadens the applicability of game theory to engineering systems where only local communication is attainable.
2) Convergence of the proposed updating strategies is analytically studied. By using singular perturbation analysis and Lyapunov stability analysis, it is shown that the proposed method enables the players to exponentially converge to the Nash equilibrium for general non-cooperative games. For quadratic games, global convergence to the Nash equilibrium is derived by using the Lyapunov stability analysis.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section II, some preliminaries are given. The problem is formulated in Section III which is followed by the main results in Section IV. In the main result part, a general non-cooperative game is considered for which local exponential convergence to the Nash equilibrium is presented. Quadratic games are addressed by using Lyapunov analysis and global asymptotic convergence to the Nash equilibrium is given. A numerical example is used to verify the effectiveness of the proposed method in Section V. Conclusions are given in Section VI.

II. Preliminaries

In this section, some preliminaries on game theory, graph theory and dynamic average consensus are provided.

Definition 1: [25] A game in normal form is defined as a triple $\Gamma \triangleq \{\mathbb{N}, X, f\}$ where $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$ is the set of N players, $X = X_1 \times \cdots \times X_N$, $X_i \subset R$ is the set of actions for player i, and $f = (f_1, \cdots, f_N)$ where f_i is the cost function of player i.

Definition 2: [24] A game Γ is a potential game if there exists a function F such that

$$\frac{\partial f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i})}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial F(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i})}{\partial x_i}, \tag{1}$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, the function F is the potential function. In (1), $\mathbf{x}_{-i}$ denotes all the players' actions other than player i, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_{-i} = [x_1, \cdots, x_{i-1}, x_{i+1}, \cdots, x_N]^T$.

Definition 3: [25] Nash equilibrium is an action profile on which no player can reduce its cost by unilaterally changing its own action, i.e., an action profile $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_i^*, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*)$ is the Nash equilibrium if for all the players $f_i(x_i^*, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*) \leq f_i(x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}^*), \forall x_i \in X_i$.

The followings are some basics on graph theory [26].

For a graph defined as $G = (V, E)$ where E is the edge set satisfying $E \subset V \times V$ with $V = \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$ being the set of nodes in the network, it is undirected if for every $(i, j) \in E$, $(j, i) \in E$. Furthermore, j is a neighbor of agent i if $(j, i) \in E$. An undirected graph is connected if there exists a path between any pair of distinct vertices. The elements in the adjacency matrix A is defined as $a_{ij} = 1$ if node j is connected with node i, else, $a_{ij} = 0$. The Laplacian matrix for the graph L is defined as $L = D - A$ where D is defined as a diagonal matrix whose ith diagonal element is equal to the out degree of node i, represented by $\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ij}$.

Theorem 1: [27], [28] Let G be a connected, undirected graph, L be the Laplacian of G. Then, for any $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in R^N$, the state of the following system

$$\begin{bmatrix} \dot{\mathbf{x}} \\ \dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} -I - L & -L \\ L & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\omega} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix},$$

with arbitrary initial conditions $\mathbf{x}(0), \boldsymbol{\eta}(0) \in R^N$ remains bounded and $\mathbf{x}(t)$ converges exponentially to $\frac{1}{N}\mathbf{1}^T\boldsymbol{\omega}\mathbf{1}$ as $t \to \infty$ where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes an N dimensional column vector composed of 1.

III. Problem Formulation

Problem 1: Consider a game with N players. The set of players is denoted by $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$. The cost function of player i is $f_i(\mathbf{x})$ where $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_N]^T \in R^N$ is the players' actions and x_i is the action of player i. All the players' cost functions are smooth functions over R^N. Each player in the game intends to minimize its own cost. Suppose that if player j is not a neighbor of player i, then, player i has no access to player j's action directly. The players can communicate with their neighbors via an undirected and connected graph. Design a Nash equilibrium seeking strategy for the players such that their actions converge to the Nash equilibrium.

The results of the paper are based on the following assumption.

Assumption 1: [1] There exist isolated stable Nash equilibria $\mathbf{x}^*$ such that for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_i}(\mathbf{x}^*) = 0$$
$$\frac{\partial^2 f_i}{\partial x_i^2}(\mathbf{x}^*) > 0.$$

Furthermore, the matrix

$$B = -\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 f_1}{\partial x_1^2}(\mathbf{x}^*) & \frac{\partial^2 f_1}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2}(\mathbf{x}^*) & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 f_1}{\partial x_1 \partial x_N}(\mathbf{x}^*) \\ \frac{\partial^2 f_2}{\partial x_1 \partial x_2}(\mathbf{x}^*) & \frac{\partial^2 f_2}{\partial x_2^2}(\mathbf{x}^*) & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ \frac{\partial^2 f_N}{\partial x_1 \partial x_N}(\mathbf{x}^*) & & & \frac{\partial^2 f_N}{\partial x_N^2}(\mathbf{x}^*) \end{bmatrix},$$

is strictly diagonally dominant.

IV. Main Results

In this section, distributed Nash equilibrium seeking strategies will be proposed based on a consensus protocol. Games with general cost functions where multiple isolated Nash equilibria may coexist will be considered. Then, quadratic games where the Nash equilibrium is unique are visited.

A. Non-cooperative Games with Non-quadratic Costs

1) General non-cooperative games: Noticing that player i has no access to the actions of the players who are not its neighbors, we suppose that each player produces estimations on the other players' actions. Let $\mathbf{x}_i = [x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \cdots, x_{iN}]^T \in R^N$ denote player i's estimation on all the players' actions and x_{ij} is player i's estimation on player j's action. Then, player i's updating strategy is designed as

$$\dot{x}_{ii} = -k_i \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_{ii}}(\mathbf{x}_i), i \in \mathbb{N} \tag{2}$$

where $k_i = \delta \bar{k}_i$, δ is a small positive parameter, and $\bar{k}_i$ is positive and fixed. Furthermore, $x_{ij} = \frac{y_{ij}}{z_{ij}}, \forall j \neq i$, $z_{ij} \neq 0$ and y_{ij}, z_{ij} for $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ are generated by

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{y}_{ij} &= -y_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{ik}(y_{ij} - y_{kj}) \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{ik}(\eta_{ij} - \eta_{kj}) + a_{ij} x_{jj} \\
\dot{\eta}_{ij} &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{ik}(y_{ij} - y_{kj}) \\
\dot{z}_{ij} &= -z_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{ik}(z_{ij} - z_{kj}) - \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{ik}(\gamma_{ij} - \gamma_{kj}) + a_{ij} \\
\dot{\gamma}_{ij} &= \sum_{k=1}^{N} a_{ik}(z_{ij} - z_{kj}),
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

based on the dynamic average consensus protocol in [27], [28]. In (3), a_{ik} denotes the element on ith row and kth column of the adjacency matrix and η_{ij}, γ_{ij} for $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ are intermediate variables.

Writing (3) in the concatenated vector form gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\mathbf{y}} &= -\mathbf{y} - (L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{y} - (L \otimes I_N)\boldsymbol{\eta} + \mathbf{h}_1 \\
\dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}} &= (L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{y} \\
\dot{\mathbf{z}} &= -\mathbf{z} - (L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{z} - (L \otimes I_N)\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \mathbf{h}_2 \\
\dot{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} &= (L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{z},
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\mathbf{y} = [\mathbf{y}_1^T, \mathbf{y}_2^T, \cdots, \mathbf{y}_N^T]^T$, $\mathbf{z} = [\mathbf{z}_1^T, \mathbf{z}_2^T, \cdots, \mathbf{z}_N^T]^T$, $\boldsymbol{\eta} = [\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^T, \boldsymbol{\eta}_2^T, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_N^T]^T$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = [\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_2^T, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_N^T]^T$, $\mathbf{h}_1 = [h_{11}^T, h_{21}^T, \cdots, h_{N1}^T]^T$, $\mathbf{h}_2 = [h_{12}^T, h_{22}^T, \cdots, h_{N2}^T]^T$, and $\mathbf{y}_i = [y_{i1}, y_{i2}, \cdots, y_{iN}]^T$, $\mathbf{z}_i = [z_{i1}, z_{i2}, \cdots, z_{iN}]^T$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i = [\eta_{i1}, \eta_{i2}, \cdots, \eta_{iN}]^T$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_i = [\gamma_{i1}, \gamma_{i2}, \cdots, \gamma_{iN}]^T$, $h_{i1} = [a_{i1}x_{11}, a_{i2}x_{22}, \cdots, a_{iN}x_{NN}]^T$, $h_{i2} = [a_{i1}, a_{i2}, \cdots, a_{iN}]^T$. Furthermore, $\otimes$ denotes the Kronecker product and I_N is an $N \times N$ dimensional identity matrix.

Similar to [20], [22], [23], [28], let $U = [U_1, U_2] \in R^{N^2 \times N^2}$, where $U_1 \in R^{N^2} \times R^{N^2 - N}$ and $U_2 \in R^{N^2} \times R^N$, be an orthogonal matrix such that $U_2^T(L \otimes I_N) = 0$. Furthermore, let $\boldsymbol{\eta} = U[\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^T, \boldsymbol{\eta}_2^T]^T$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = U[\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^T, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_2^T]^T$ where $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 \in R^{N^2 - N}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_2, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_2 \in R^N$. Then, (4) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\mathbf{y}} &= -\mathbf{y} - (L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{y} - ((L \otimes I_N)U_1)\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 + \mathbf{h}_1 \\
\dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1 &= U_1^T(L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{y} \\
\dot{\mathbf{z}} &= -\mathbf{z} - (L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{z} - ((L \otimes I_N)U_1)\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2 \\
\dot{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_1 &= U_1^T(L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{z},
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_2(t) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_2(0)$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_2(t) = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_2(0)$.

The following results will be used in the subsequent analysis.

Suppose that the communication graph is undirected and connected. Then,

1) The matrix $H_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -I_{N^2} - L \otimes I_N & -(L \otimes I_N)U_1 \\ U_1^T(L \otimes I_N) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$, where I_{N^2} denotes an $N^2 \times N^2$ dimensional identity matrix, is Hurwitz [28].
2) By Theorem 1, the updating strategy in (3) enables y_{ij},z_{ij} to exponentially converge to $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{ij}x_{jj}$, and $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{ij}$, $\forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, respectively, for fixed x_{jj}. Therefore, y_{ij},z_{ij} in (5) converge to $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{ij}x_{jj}$, and $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{ij}$, $\forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, respectively, for fixed x_{jj}.
3) The quasi-steady states of $\mathbf{y}$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1$ are linear functions of $\mathbf{x}_{ES}$ where $\mathbf{x}_{ES} = [x_{11}, x_{22}, \cdots, x_{NN}]^T$ [20] and the quasi-steady states of $\mathbf{z}$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1$ are constants.

Remark 1: The third conclusion is based on the fact that on the quasi-steady states

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}^q \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q \end{bmatrix} = -H_1^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_1 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \tag{6}$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{z}^q \\ \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^q \end{bmatrix} = -H_1^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{h}_2 \\ \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

where $\mathbf{y}^q$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q$, $\mathbf{z}^q$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^q$ denote the quasi-steady states of $\mathbf{y}$,$\boldsymbol{\eta}_1$, $\mathbf{z}$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1$, respectively.

In the following, we show that the updating strategy in (2) and (5) enable the players to converge to the Nash equilibrium.

Let $\mathbf{e}_c(t) = [(\mathbf{z}(t) - \mathbf{z}^q)^T, (\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1(t) - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^q)^T]^T$, $\bar{\mathbf{x}} = [x_{11} - x_{11}^*, x_{22} - x_{22}^*, \cdots, x_{NN} - x_N^*]^T$ and $\mathbf{x}^* = [x_1^*, x_2^*, \cdots, x_N^*]^T$ denote the Nash equilibrium.

Theorem 2: Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied, the communication graph is undirected and connected. Then, there exists a positive constant δ^* such that for every $0 < \delta < \delta^*$, $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \mathbf{e}_c(t), \mathbf{y}(t) - \mathbf{y}^q(\mathbf{x}^*), \boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q(\mathbf{x}^*))$ converges exponentially to zero under the updating strategies in (2) and (5) if $||\bar{\mathbf{x}}(0)||$, $||\mathbf{e}_c(0)||$, $||\mathbf{y}(0) - \mathbf{y}^q(\mathbf{x}^*)||$, $||\boldsymbol{\eta}_1(0) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q(\mathbf{x}^*)||$, $|\frac{y_{ij}(0)}{z_{ij(0)}} - x_{jj}^*|, j \in \mathbb{N}_{-i}, i \in \mathbb{N}$ are sufficiently small.

Proof: Let $\tau = \delta t$. Then, at $\tau-$time scale,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dx_{ii}}{d\tau} &= -\bar{k}_i \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_{ii}}(x_{ii}, \frac{y_{ij}}{z_{ij}}), j \in \mathbb{N}_{-i}, i \in \mathbb{N} \\
\delta\frac{d\mathbf{y}}{d\tau} &= -\mathbf{y} - (L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{y} - (L \otimes I_N)U_1\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 + \mathbf{h}_1 \\
\delta\frac{d\boldsymbol{\eta}_1}{d\tau} &= U_1^T(L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{y} \\
\delta\frac{d\mathbf{z}}{d\tau} &= -\mathbf{z} - (L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{z} - (L \otimes I_N)U_1\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2 \\
\delta\frac{d\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1}{d\tau} &= U_1^T(L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{z},
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

which is in the standard form of singular perturbation analysis for $z_{ij} \neq 0$. In (8), $\mathbb{N}_{-i} = \{1, 2, \cdots, i-1, i+1, \cdots, N\}$ is the set of players other than player i.

Quasi-steady state analysis: Letting $\delta = 0$ freezes the fast variables $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1$ to the quasi-steady states on which $\frac{y_{ij}}{z_{ij}} = x_{jj}$. On the quasi-steady states, the reduced-system can be written as

$$\frac{dx_{ii}}{d\tau} = -\bar{k}_i \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_{ii}}(\mathbf{x}_{ES}), i \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{9}$$

The equilibrium point of (9) is

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_{ii}}(\mathbf{x}_{ES}) = 0, i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Hence, the Nash equilibrium of the non-cooperative game is the equilibrium point of the system in (9). Linearizing (9) at the Nash equilibrium gives

$$\frac{d\bar{\mathbf{x}}}{d\tau} = \bar{\mathbf{k}}B\bar{\mathbf{x}}, \tag{10}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{k}} = \text{diag}\{\bar{k}_1, \bar{k}_2, \cdots, \bar{k}_N\}$. By Assumption 1 and the Gershgorin Circle Theorem [30], $\bar{\mathbf{k}}B$ is Hurwitz. Hence, there exist positive constants ρ_1, ρ_2 such that

$$||\bar{\mathbf{x}}(\tau)|| \leq \rho_1 e^{-\rho_2 \tau}||\bar{\mathbf{x}}(0)||, \tag{11}$$

for every $||\bar{\mathbf{x}}(0)||$ that is sufficiently small.

Boundary-layer analysis: By similar analysis as in [20], the boundary-layer model is

$$\begin{aligned}
\begin{bmatrix} \frac{d\bar{\mathbf{y}}}{d\tau} \\ \frac{d\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1}{d\tau} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} -I_{N^2} - L \otimes I_N & -(L \otimes I_N)U_1 \\ U_1^T(L \otimes I_N) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{y}} \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1 \end{bmatrix} \\
\begin{bmatrix} \frac{d\bar{\mathbf{z}}}{d\tau} \\ \frac{d\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_1}{d\tau} \end{bmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} -I_{N^2} - L \otimes I_N & -(L \otimes I_N)U_1 \\ U_1^T(L \otimes I_N) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{z}} \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_1 \end{bmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^q$,$\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1 = \boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q$, $\bar{\mathbf{z}} = \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}^q$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_1 = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^q$.

The boundary-layer system is exponentially stable, uniformly in $(t, \mathbf{x}_{ES})$ as the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} -I_{N^2} - L \otimes I_N & -(L \otimes I_N)U_1 \\ U_1^T(L \otimes I_N) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$ is Hurwitz.

Singular point avoidance: For the system in (2) and (5), the domain of definition is $z_{ij}(t) \neq 0, \forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence, the trajectory of the following system

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\mathbf{z}} &= -\mathbf{z} - (L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{z} - (L \otimes I_N)U_1\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2 \\
\dot{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_1 &= U_1^T(L \otimes I_N)\mathbf{z},
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

should not contain $z_{ij}(t) = 0, \forall t \geq 0$. Since the matrix $H_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -I_{N^2} - L \otimes I_N & -(L \otimes I_N)U_1 \\ U_1^T(L \otimes I_N) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$ is Hurwitz, there exists a symmetric positive definite matrix P such that

$$PH_1 + H_1^T P = -Q,$$

where Q is a symmetric positive definite matrix. Define the Lyapunov candidate function as

$$V = \mathbf{e}_c^T P \mathbf{e}_c. \tag{14}$$

Then, $\lambda_{min}(P)||\mathbf{e}_c||^2 \leq V \leq \lambda_{max}(P)||\mathbf{e}_c||^2$. The time derivative of V satisfies

$$\dot{V} = -\mathbf{e}_c^T Q \mathbf{e}_c \leq -\lambda_{min}(Q)||\mathbf{e}_c||^2.$$

Therefore, $V(t) \leq V(0), \forall t \geq 0$. Hence,

$$\lambda_{min}(P)||\mathbf{e}_c(t)||^2 \leq V(t) \leq V(0), \tag{15}$$

i.e.,

$$||\mathbf{e}_c(t)|| \leq \sqrt{\frac{V(0)}{\lambda_{min}(P)}}.$$

If

$$\sqrt{\frac{V(0)}{\lambda_{min}(P)}} \leq \min_j\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij}\} - \varepsilon, \tag{16}$$

where ε is a small positive constant that satisfies $\min_j\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij}\} - \varepsilon > 0$, then, $z_{ij}(t) \neq 0, \forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}, \forall t$.

To achieve (16), let

$$\sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{max}(P)}{\lambda_{min}(P)}}||\mathbf{e}_c(0)|| \leq \min_j\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij}\} - \varepsilon, \tag{17}$$

since $V(0) \leq \lambda_{max}(P)||\mathbf{e}_c(0)||^2$. That is, for every

$$||\mathbf{e}_c(0)|| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{min}(P)}{\lambda_{max}(P)}}\Big(\min_j\{\tfrac{1}{N}\textstyle\sum_{i=1, i\neq j}^N a_{ij}\} - \varepsilon \Big), \tag{18}$$

$z_{ij}(t) \neq 0, \forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}, \forall t$. Furthermore,

$$\frac{1}{z_{ij}} \in \Big[\frac{1}{\min_j \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij} + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij} - \varepsilon}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \Big],$$

for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $\forall t$.

Hence, by Theorem 11.4 in [29], it can be concluded that there exists a positive constant δ^* such that for every $0 < \delta < \delta^*$, $(\bar{\mathbf{x}}(t), \mathbf{e}_c(t), \mathbf{y}(t) - \mathbf{y}^q(\mathbf{x}^*), \boldsymbol{\eta}_1(t) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q(\mathbf{x}^*))$ converges exponentially to zero if $||\bar{\mathbf{x}}(0)||$, $||\mathbf{e}_c(0)||$, $||\mathbf{y}(0) - \mathbf{y}^q(\mathbf{x}^*)||$, $||\boldsymbol{\eta}_1(0) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q(\mathbf{x}^*)||$, $|\frac{y_{ij}(0)}{z_{ij(0)}} - x_{jj}^*|, j \in \mathbb{N}_{-i}, i \in \mathbb{N}$ are sufficiently small.

□

Remark 2: It can be seen from the analysis that $\mathbf{x}_{ES}$ converges to the Nash equilibrium and $\mathbf{y}$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1$, $\mathbf{z}$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1$ converge to their quasi-steady states (at the Nash equilibrium), respectively, by using (2) and (5). Hence, the updating strategies in (2)-(3) enable $\mathbf{x}_{ES}$ to converge to the Nash equilibrium for $||\bar{\mathbf{x}}(0)||$, $||\mathbf{e}_c(0)||$, $||\mathbf{y}(0) - \mathbf{y}^q(\mathbf{x}^*)||$, $||\boldsymbol{\eta}_1(0) - \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q(\mathbf{x}^*)||$, $|\frac{y_{ij}(0)}{z_{ij(0)}} - x_{jj}^*|, j \in \mathbb{N}_{-i}, i \in \mathbb{N}$ that are sufficiently small. Furthermore, all the other state variables in (3) stay bounded. Note that the $||\mathbf{e}_c(0)||$ should be sufficiently small to avoid the singular point.

2) Potential game: In this section, potential games are considered under the following assumption.

Assumption 2: Suppose that the non-cooperative game is a potential game and the potential function $F(\mathbf{x})$ has a minimum and satisfies

$$(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*)^T\frac{\partial F(\mathbf{x})}{\partial \mathbf{x}} \geq m||\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}^*||^2, \tag{19}$$

for some positive constant m.

By using the same updating strategy as in (2)-(3), the following conclusion can be derived.

Theorem 3: Suppose that Assumption 2 is satisfied and the communication graph is undirected and connected. Then, there exists a positive constant δ^* such that for every $0 < \delta < \delta^*$, $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{z}^q, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^q, \mathbf{y}^q(\mathbf{x}^*), \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q(\mathbf{x}^*))$ is exponentially stable under the updating strategy in (2) and (5) if $||\mathbf{e}(0)|| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{min}(P)}{\lambda_{max}(P)}}\left(\min_j\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij}\}-\varepsilon\right)$.

Proof: Following the proof of Theorem 2 and letting $\delta = 0$ gives the quasi-steady state. The subsequent analysis is on the quasi-steady state analysis.

Quasi-steady state analysis: On the quasi-steady state, the reduced system is

$$\frac{dx_{ii}}{d\tau} = -\bar{k}_i\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_{ii}}(\mathbf{x}_{ES}), i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Define the Lyapunov candidate function as

$$V = \frac{1}{2}\bar{\mathbf{x}}^T\bar{\mathbf{k}}^{-1}\bar{\mathbf{x}}.$$

Then, the time-derivative of V is

$$\dot{V} = -\bar{\mathbf{x}}^T\begin{bmatrix}\frac{\partial f_1(\mathbf{x}_{ES})}{\partial x_{11}}\\ \frac{\partial f_2(\mathbf{x}_{ES})}{\partial x_{22}}\\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f_N(\mathbf{x}_{ES})}{\partial x_{NN}}\end{bmatrix} = -\bar{\mathbf{x}}^T\frac{\partial F(\mathbf{x}_{ES})}{\partial \mathbf{x}_{ES}} \leq -m||\bar{\mathbf{x}}||^2. \tag{20}$$

Therefore, the reduced-system is globally exponentially stable.

The subsequent analysis follows that of Theorem 2 and is omitted here. ∎

B. Quadratic Games

In this section, quadratic games are considered. Suppose that player i's cost function is

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^N\sum_{k=1}^N h_{jk}^i x_j x_k + \sum_{j=1}^N v_j^i x_j + g_i, \tag{21}$$

where h_{jk}^i, v_j^i, g_i are the coefficients of the quadratic terms, monomial terms and constant terms, respectively. Furthermore, $h_{jk}^i = h_{kj}^i, \forall i \in \mathbb{N}$ by definition.

Lemma 1: Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied for the quadratic game. Then, matrix H, defined as

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} h_{11}^1 & h_{12}^1 & \cdots & h_{1N}^1 \\ h_{21}^2 & h_{22}^2 & \cdots & h_{2N}^2 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \\ h_{N1}^N & h_{N2}^N & \cdots & h_{NN}^N \end{bmatrix},$$

is invertible and the Nash equilibrium of the quadratic game is unique.

Proof: Through direct calculation, it can be derived that the Nash equilibrium of the quadratic game exists if

$$H\mathbf{x} + v = 0, \tag{22}$$

where $v = [v_1^1, v_2^2, \cdots, v_N^N]^T$, has a solution. By Assumption 1, the Nash equilibrium exists. Hence,

1) H is invertible by which the Nash equilibrium is unique given by $\mathbf{x}^* = -H^{-1}v$;
2) H is not invertible and $rank\{H\} = rank\{H, v\}$.

For the second case, $rank\{H\} < N$. Hence, multiple Nash equilibria exist. However, the Nash equilibria are not isolated. Hence, if Assumption 1 is satisfied for the quadratic game, then H is invertible and the Nash equilibrium exists and unique. Furthermore, the Nash equilibrium is $\mathbf{x}^* = -H^{-1}v$. ∎

Suppose that every player in the game updates their actions according to

$$\dot{x}_{ii} = -k_i(\sum_{j=1}^N h_{ij}^i y_{ij} + v_i^i z_{ii}) \tag{23a}$$

$$\dot{y}_{ij} = -y_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^N a_{ik}(y_{ij}-y_{kj}) - \sum_{k=1}^N a_{ik}(\eta_{ij}-\eta_{kj}) + a_{ij}x_{jj} \tag{23b}$$

$$\dot{\eta}_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^N a_{ik}(y_{ij}-y_{kj}) \tag{23c}$$

$$\dot{z}_{ij} = -z_{ij} - \sum_{k=1}^N a_{ik}(z_{ij}-z_{kj}) - \sum_{k=1}^N a_{ik}(\gamma_{ij}-\gamma_{kj}) + a_{ij} \tag{23d}$$

$$\dot{\gamma}_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^N a_{ik}(z_{ij}-z_{kj}), \tag{23e}$$

where (23b)-(23e) are based on the dynamic average consensus in Theorem 1. Then, the following result can be derived.

Theorem 4: Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied and the communication graph is undirected and connected. Then, there exists a positive constant δ^* such that for every $0 < \delta < \delta^*$, the Nash equilibrium of the quadratic game is globally exponentially stable under the updating strategy in (23) if $A = \text{diag}\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij}, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is interchangeable with H^{-1}.

Proof: Following Section IV-A to introduce the orthogonal matrix gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\mathbf{y}} &= -\mathbf{y} - (L\otimes I_N)\mathbf{y} - ((L\otimes I_N)U_1)\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 + \mathbf{h}_1\\
\dot{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1 &= U_1^T(L\otimes I_N)\mathbf{y}\\
\dot{\mathbf{z}} &= -\mathbf{z} - (L\otimes I_N)\mathbf{z} - ((L\otimes I_N)U_1)\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 + \mathbf{h}_2\\
\dot{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_1 &= U_1^T(L\otimes I_N)\mathbf{z},
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_2(t) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_2(0)$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_2(t) = \boldsymbol{\gamma}_2(0)$. Define

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathbf{y}} &= \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{y}^q \\ \bar{\mathbf{z}} &= \mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}^q \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1 &= \boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_1 &= \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1 - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^q,\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $\mathbf{y}^q(\mathbf{x}_{ES}) = [\mathbf{y}_1^q(\mathbf{x}_{ES})^T, \mathbf{y}_2^q(\mathbf{x}_{ES})^T, \cdots, \mathbf{y}_N^q(\mathbf{x}_{ES})^T]^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q(\mathbf{x}_{ES}) = [\boldsymbol{\eta}_{11}^q(\mathbf{x}_{ES})^T, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{21}^q(\mathbf{x}_{ES})^T, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{N1}^q(\mathbf{x}_{ES})^T]^T$ are linear functions of the elements in $\mathbf{x}_{ES} = [x_{11}, x_{22}, \cdots, x_{NN}]^T$ and $\mathbf{z}^q = [z_{11}^q, z_{12}^q, \cdots, z_{NN}^q]^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^q = [\gamma_{11}^q, \gamma_{12}^q, \cdots, \gamma_{NN}^q]^T$ are constants.

Hence, at $\tau-$ time scale,

$$\delta \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d\bar{\mathbf{y}}}{d\tau} \\ \frac{d\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1}{d\tau} \\ \frac{d\bar{\mathbf{z}}}{d\tau} \\ \frac{d\bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_1}{d\tau} \end{bmatrix} = H_2 \begin{bmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{y}} \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1 \\ \bar{\mathbf{z}} \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_1 \end{bmatrix} - \delta \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d\mathbf{y}^q}{d\tau} \\ \frac{d\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q}{d\tau} \\ \frac{d\mathbf{z}^q}{d\tau} \\ \frac{d\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^q}{d\tau} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{26}$$

where $H_2 = I_2 \otimes \begin{bmatrix} -I_{N^2} - L \otimes I_N & -(L \otimes I_N)U_1 \\ U_1^T(L \otimes I_N) & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{dx_{11}}{d\tau} \\ \frac{dx_{22}}{d\tau} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{dx_{NN}}{d\tau} \end{bmatrix} = -\bar{\mathbf{k}} \left(H_h \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_1 \\ \mathbf{y}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{y}_N \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} v_1^1 z_{11} \\ v_2^2 z_{22} \\ \vdots \\ v_N^N z_{NN} \end{bmatrix} \right), \tag{27}$$

where

$$\bar{\mathbf{k}} = \begin{bmatrix} \bar{k}_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{k}_2 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \bar{k}_N \end{bmatrix},$$

$$H_h = \begin{bmatrix} h_{11}^1 & \cdots & h_{1N}^1 & 0 & \cdots & & & & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & h_{21}^2 & \cdots & h_{2N}^2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ & & & & & \ddots & & & \\ 0 & \cdots & & & & 0 & h_{N1}^N & \cdots & h_{NN}^N \end{bmatrix}.$$

Substituting (25) into (27) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{bmatrix} \frac{dx_{11}}{d\tau} \\ \frac{dx_{22}}{d\tau} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{dx_{NN}}{d\tau} \end{bmatrix} &= -\bar{\mathbf{k}} H \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{i1}x_{11} \\ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{i2}x_{22} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{iN}x_{NN} \end{bmatrix} - \\ &\bar{\mathbf{k}} \begin{bmatrix} v_1^1 \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{i1} \\ v_2^2 \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{i2} \\ \vdots \\ v_N^N \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{iN} \end{bmatrix} - \bar{\mathbf{k}} H_h \bar{\mathbf{y}} - \bar{\mathbf{k}} \begin{bmatrix} v_1^1 \bar{z}_{11} \\ v_2^2 \bar{z}_{22} \\ \vdots \\ v_N^N \bar{z}_{NN} \end{bmatrix},\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

by using $\mathbf{y}_i^q = [\frac{\sum_{i=1}^N a_{i1}x_{11}}{N}, \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N a_{i2}x_{22}}{N}, \cdots, \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N a_{iN}x_{NN}}{N}]^T$ and $\mathbf{z}_i^q = [\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{i1}, \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{i2}, \cdots, \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{iN}]^T$. Define $x'_{jj} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij}x_{jj}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\begin{bmatrix} \frac{dx'_{11}}{d\tau} \\ \frac{dx'_{22}}{d\tau} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{dx'_{NN}}{d\tau} \end{bmatrix} =& H_3 \begin{bmatrix} x'_{11} \\ x'_{22} \\ \vdots \\ x'_{NN} \end{bmatrix} - A\bar{\mathbf{k}}A \begin{bmatrix} v_1^1 \\ v_2^2 \\ \vdots \\ v_N^N \end{bmatrix} \\ &- A\bar{\mathbf{k}}H_h \begin{bmatrix} \bar{y}_{11} \\ \bar{y}_{12} \\ \vdots \\ \bar{y}_{NN} \end{bmatrix} - A\bar{\mathbf{k}} \begin{bmatrix} v_1^1 \bar{z}_{11} \\ v_2^2 \bar{z}_{22} \\ \vdots \\ v_N^N \bar{z}_{NN} \end{bmatrix},\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where $H_3 = -A\bar{\mathbf{k}}H$ and $A = \text{diag}\{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N a_{ij}, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Define $\bar{\mathbf{x}}' = \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}'^e$ where $\mathbf{x}' = [x'_{11}, x'_{22}, \cdots, x'_{NN}]^T$, and $\mathbf{x}'^e$ is defined as a vector for which $H_3\mathbf{x}'^e - A\bar{\mathbf{k}}Av = 0$, $v = [v_1^1, v_2^2, \cdots, v_N^N]^T$. Then,

$$\frac{d\bar{\mathbf{x}}'}{d\tau} = H_3\bar{\mathbf{x}}' - A\bar{\mathbf{k}}H_h\bar{\mathbf{y}} - A\bar{\mathbf{k}}Z_v \tag{30}$$

where $Z_v = [v_1^1\bar{z}_{11}, v_2^2\bar{z}_{22}, \cdots, v_N^N\bar{z}_{NN}]^T$.

Noticing that H_2, H_3 (by Assumption 1) are Hurwitz matrices, it can be concluded that there exist symmetric positive definite matrices P_1, P_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned}P_1H_2 + H_2^TP_1 &= -Q_1 \\ P_2H_3 + H_3^TP_2 &= -Q_2,\end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

for some symmetric positive definite matrices Q_1, Q_2. Define a Lyapunov candidate function as

$$V = c\mathbf{e}^TP_1\mathbf{e} + (1-c)\bar{\mathbf{x}}'^TP_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}', \tag{32}$$

where $\mathbf{e} = [\bar{\mathbf{y}}^T, \bar{\mathbf{z}}^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_1^T]^T$ and c is a positive constant and $c \in (0,1)$.

Taking the time derivative of V gives

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &= c(\dot{\mathbf{e}}^TP_1\mathbf{e} + \mathbf{e}^TP_1\dot{\mathbf{e}}) + (1-c)(\dot{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}'^TP_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}' + \bar{\mathbf{x}}'^TP_2\dot{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}') \\ &= \frac{c}{\delta}(\mathbf{e}^TH_2^T - \delta[\dot{\mathbf{e}}^q]^T)P_1\mathbf{e} + \frac{c}{\delta}\mathbf{e}^TP_1(H_2\mathbf{e} - \delta\dot{\mathbf{e}}^q) \\ &+ (1-c)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}'^TH_3^T - \bar{\mathbf{y}}^TH_h^T\bar{\mathbf{k}}A - Z_v^T\bar{\mathbf{k}}A)P_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}' \\ &+ (1-c)\bar{\mathbf{x}}'^TP_2(H_3\bar{\mathbf{x}}' - A\bar{\mathbf{k}}H_h\bar{\mathbf{y}} - A\bar{\mathbf{k}}Z_v) \\ &= -\frac{c}{\delta}\mathbf{e}^TQ_1\mathbf{e} - (1-c)\bar{\mathbf{x}}'^TQ_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}' \\ &- c[\dot{\mathbf{e}}^q]^TP_1\mathbf{e} - c\mathbf{e}^TP_1\dot{\mathbf{e}}^q \\ &- (1-c)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}^TH_h^T\bar{\mathbf{k}}A + Z_v^T\bar{\mathbf{k}}A)P_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}' \\ &- (1-c)\bar{\mathbf{x}}'^TP_2(A\bar{\mathbf{k}}H_h\bar{\mathbf{y}} + A\bar{\mathbf{k}}Z_v),\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where $\dot{\mathbf{e}}^q = [[\frac{d\mathbf{y}^q}{d\tau}]^T, [\frac{d\mathbf{z}^q}{d\tau}]^T, [\frac{d\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q}{d\tau}]^T, [\frac{d\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1^q}{d\tau}]^T]^T$.

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{V} &\le -\frac{c}{\delta}\mathbf{e}^TQ_1\mathbf{e} - (1-c)\bar{\mathbf{x}}'^TQ_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}' \\ &+ c\beta_1||\mathbf{e}||||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'|| + c\beta_2||\mathbf{e}||^2 + (1-c)\beta_3||\mathbf{e}||||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'|| \\ &\le -\frac{c}{\delta}\lambda_{min}(Q_1)||\mathbf{e}||^2 - (1-c)\lambda_{min}(Q_2)||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'||^2 \\ &+ c\beta_1||\mathbf{e}||||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'|| + c\beta_2||\mathbf{e}||^2 + (1-c)\beta_3||\mathbf{e}||||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'|| \\ &= -[||\mathbf{e}||, ||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'||]M \begin{bmatrix} ||\mathbf{e}|| \\ ||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'|| \end{bmatrix},\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

for some positive constants β_1, β_2, β_3 and the matrix M is defined as

$$M = \left[\begin{array}{cc} \frac{c}{\delta}\lambda_{min}(Q_1) - c\beta_2 & -\frac{1}{2}[c\beta_1 + (1-c)\beta_3] \\ -\frac{1}{2}[c\beta_1 + (1-c)\beta_3] & (1-c)\lambda_{min}(Q_2) \end{array} \right]. \quad (35)$$

Hence, if M is positive definite, the equilibrium point is globally exponentially stable. Let $(\frac{c}{\delta}\lambda_{min}(Q_1) - c\beta_2)(1-c)\lambda_{min}(Q_2) > (\frac{1}{2}[c\beta_1 + (1-c)\beta_3])^2$. Then, it can be derived that

$$\delta < \frac{4c(1-c)\lambda_{min}(Q_1)\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}{(c\beta_1 + (1-c)\beta_3)^2 + 4c(1-c)\beta_2\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}. \quad (36)$$

Hence, if $\delta < \frac{4c(1-c)\lambda_{min}(Q_1)\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}{(c\beta_1+(1-c)\beta_3)^2+4c(1-c)\beta_2\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}$, M is symmetric positive definite. Therefore, for every $0 < \delta < \delta^*$ with $\delta^* = \frac{4c(1-c)\lambda_{min}(Q_1)\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}{(c\beta_1+(1-c)\beta_3)^2+4c(1-c)\beta_2\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}$, the equilibrium is globally exponentially stable.

By the above analysis, the equilibrium point is $\mathbf{x}'^e = -H^{-1}Av$. Since $x'_{jj} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{ij}x_{jj}$, it can be derived that at the equilibrium point of (28)

$$\mathbf{x}^e = -A^{-1}H^{-1}Av. \quad (37)$$

From another aspect, it can be derived that the Nash equilibrium is

$$\mathbf{x}^* = -H^{-1}v. \quad (38)$$

Therefore, if A and H^{-1} are interchangeable, the equilibrium point $\mathbf{x}^e$ is equal to the Nash equilibrium. Hence, the Nash equilibrium is globally exponentially stable. □

Theorem 5: Suppose that Assumption 1 is satisfied and the communication graph is undirected and connected. Then, there exists a positive constant δ^* such that for every $0 < \delta < \delta^*$, $l_{ii}(t) = z_{ii}(t)x_{ii}(t) \to x_i^*$ as $t \to \infty$ by using

$$\dot{x}_{ii} = -k_i(\sum_{j=1}^{N} h_{ij}^i y_{ij} + v_i^i), \quad (39)$$

and the updating strategy in (23b)-(23e).

Proof: Following the proof of Theorem 4, it can be derived that at $\tau-$time scale,

$$\delta \left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{d\bar{\mathbf{y}}}{d\tau} \\ \frac{d\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1}{d\tau} \end{array} \right] = H_1 \left[\begin{array}{c} \bar{\mathbf{y}} \\ \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1 \end{array} \right] - \delta \left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{d\mathbf{y}^q}{d\tau} \\ \frac{d\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q}{d\tau} \end{array} \right]. \quad (40)$$

Furthermore,

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{dx_{11}}{d\tau} \\ \frac{dx_{22}}{d\tau} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{dx_{NN}}{d\tau} \end{array} \right] = -\bar{\mathbf{k}} \left(H_h \left[\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{y}_1 \\ \mathbf{y}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{y}_N \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{c} v_1^1 \\ v_2^2 \\ \vdots \\ v_N^N \end{array} \right] \right). \quad (41)$$

Hence,

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{dx_{11}}{d\tau} \\ \frac{dx_{22}}{d\tau} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{dx_{NN}}{d\tau} \end{array} \right] = -\bar{\mathbf{k}}H \left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{i1}x_{11} \\ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{i2}x_{22} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{iN}x_{NN} \end{array} \right] - \bar{\mathbf{k}}H_h\bar{\mathbf{y}} - \bar{\mathbf{k}}v. \quad (42)$$

Define $x'_{jj} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{ij}x_{jj}$. Then,

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \frac{dx'_{11}}{d\tau} \\ \frac{dx'_{22}}{d\tau} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{dx'_{NN}}{d\tau} \end{array} \right] = H_3 \left[\begin{array}{c} x'_{11} \\ x'_{22} \\ \vdots \\ x'_{NN} \end{array} \right] - A\bar{\mathbf{k}}H_h \left[\begin{array}{c} \bar{y}_{11} \\ \bar{y}_{12} \\ \vdots \\ \bar{y}_{NN} \end{array} \right] - A\bar{\mathbf{k}} \left[\begin{array}{c} v_1^1 \\ v_2^2 \\ \vdots \\ v_N^N \end{array} \right]. \quad (43)$$

Define $\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1 = \mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}'^e_1$ where $\mathbf{x}' = [x'_{11}, x'_{22}, \cdots, x'_{NN}]^T$, and $\mathbf{x}'^e_1$ is defined as a vector for which $H_3\mathbf{x}'^e_1 - A\bar{\mathbf{k}}v = 0$. Then,

$$\frac{d\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1}{d\tau} = H_3\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1 - A\bar{\mathbf{k}}H_h\bar{\mathbf{y}}. \quad (44)$$

Noticing that H_1, H_3 (by Assumption 1) are Hurwitz matrices, it can be concluded that there exist symmetric positive definite matrices P, P_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned} PH_1 + H_1^T P &= -Q \\ P_2H_3 + H_3^T P_2 &= -Q_2, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

for some symmetric positive definite matrices Q, Q_2. Define a Lyapunov candidate function as

$$V = c\mathbf{e}_1^T P\mathbf{e}_1 + (1-c)\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1'^T P_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1, \quad (46)$$

where $\mathbf{e}_1 = [\bar{\mathbf{y}}^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1^T]^T$ and c is a positive constant and $c \in (0,1)$.

Taking the time derivative of V gives

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &= c(\dot{\mathbf{e}}_1{}^T P\mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_1^T P\dot{\mathbf{e}}_1) + (1-c)(\dot{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}_1'^T P_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1 + \bar{\mathbf{x}}_1'^T P_2\dot{\bar{\mathbf{x}}}'_1) \\ &= \frac{c}{\delta}(\mathbf{e}_1^T H_1^T - \delta[\dot{\mathbf{e}}_1^q]^T)P\mathbf{e}_1 + \frac{c}{\delta}\mathbf{e}_1^T P(H_1\mathbf{e}_1 - \delta\dot{\mathbf{e}}_1^q) \\ &+ (1-c)(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1'^T H_3^T - \bar{\mathbf{y}}^T H_h^T\bar{\mathbf{k}}A)P_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1 \\ &+ (1-c)\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1'^T P_2(H_3\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1 - A\bar{\mathbf{k}}H_h\bar{\mathbf{y}}) \\ &= -\frac{c}{\delta}\mathbf{e}_1^T Q\mathbf{e}_1 - (1-c)\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1'^T Q_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1 \\ &- c[\dot{\mathbf{e}}_1^q]^T P\mathbf{e}_1 - c\mathbf{e}_1^T P\dot{\mathbf{e}}_1^q \\ &- (1-c)(\bar{\mathbf{y}}^T H_h^T\bar{\mathbf{k}}A)P_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1 \\ &- (1-c)\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1'^T P_2(A\bar{\mathbf{k}}H_h\bar{\mathbf{y}}), \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where $\dot{\mathbf{e}}_1^q = [[\frac{d\mathbf{y}^q}{d\tau}]^T, [\frac{d\boldsymbol{\eta}_1^q}{d\tau}]^T]^T$.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{V} &\le -\frac{c}{\delta}\mathbf{e}_1^T Q\mathbf{e}_1 - (1-c)\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1'^T Q_2\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1 \\ &+ c\beta_{11}||\mathbf{e}_1||||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1|| + c\beta_{22}||\mathbf{e}_1||^2 + (1-c)\beta_{33}||\mathbf{e}_1||||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1|| \\ &\le -\frac{c}{\delta}\lambda_{min}(Q)||\mathbf{e}_1||^2 - (1-c)\lambda_{min}(Q_2)||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1||^2 \\ &+ c\beta_{11}||\mathbf{e}_1||||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1|| + c\beta_{22}||\mathbf{e}_1||^2 + (1-c)\beta_{33}||\mathbf{e}_1||||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1|| \\ &= -[||\mathbf{e}_1||, ||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1||]M_1 \left[\begin{array}{c} ||\mathbf{e}_1|| \\ ||\bar{\mathbf{x}}'_1|| \end{array} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

for some positive constants β_{11}, β_{22}, β_{33} and the matrix M_1 is defined as

$$M_1 = \left[\begin{array}{cc} \frac{c}{\delta}\lambda_{min}(Q) - c\beta_{22} & -\frac{1}{2}[c\beta_{11} + (1-c)\beta_{33}] \\ -\frac{1}{2}[c\beta_{11} + (1-c)\beta_{33}] & (1-c)\lambda_{min}(Q_2) \end{array} \right]. \quad (49)$$

Hence, if M_1 is positive definite, the equilibrium point is globally exponentially stable. Let $(\frac{c}{\delta}\lambda_{min}(Q) - c\beta_{22})(1-$



Fig. 1: Communication graph for the players.

$c)\lambda_{min}(Q_2) > (\frac{1}{2}[c\beta_{11}+(1-c)\beta_{33}])^2$. Then, it can be derived that

$$\delta < \frac{4c(1-c)\lambda_{min}(Q)\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}{(c\beta_{11}+(1-c)\beta_{33})^2+4c(1-c)\beta_{22}\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}. \quad (50)$$

Hence, if $\delta < \frac{4c(1-c)\lambda_{min}(Q)\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}{(c\beta_{11}+(1-c)\beta_{33})^2+4c(1-c)\beta_{22}\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}$, M_1 is symmetric positive definite. Therefore, for every $0 < \delta < \delta^*$ with $\delta^* = \frac{4c(1-c)\lambda_{min}(Q)\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}{(c\beta_{11}+(1-c)\beta_{33})^2+4c(1-c)\beta_{22}\lambda_{min}(Q_2)}$, the equilibrium is globally exponentially stable.

By the above analysis, the equilibrium point is $\mathbf{x}'^e = -H^{-1}Av$. Since $x'_{jj} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{ij}x_{jj}$, it can be derived that at the equilibrium point of (42)

$$\mathbf{x}^e = -A^{-1}H^{-1}v. \quad (51)$$

Furthermore, $z_{ii}(t)$ converges exponentially to $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{ji}$. Hence, the conclusion is derived. □

Remark 3: In this paper, we suppose that the players in the game adopt the proposed updating strategies (e.g., (3), (23) or (39), respectively) to search for the Nash equilibrium. The updating strategies require the players to be truthful, i.e., they will not lie about their information during Nash equilibrium seeking process. For games that are strategy-proof, the players have no incentive to lie about their private information.

V. Numerical Example

In this section, a numerical example is presented to verify the convergence of the proposed method. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) =&(10x_1 + x_2 + x_3 - 13)^2 + (x_1 + 10x_2 + x_3 - 13)^2 \\ &+ (x_1 + x_2 + 10x_3 - 22)^2 + (10x_4 + x_5 - 31)^2 \\ &+ (x_4 + 10x_5 - 13)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The function $f(\mathbf{x})$ is at its minimum when $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5) = (2, -4, 6, 3, 1)$. Suppose that player i's cost function is $f_i(\mathbf{x}) = m_i f(\mathbf{x}) + d_i, i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, 5\}$ where m_i, d_i are constants and $m_i > 0$. Furthermore, let x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_5 denote player 1-5's actions, respectively. Then, the game is strategy-proof, i.e., if any player reports fake data to its neighbors which leads to non-Nash solution, the players' costs will increase. In the simulation, $m_i = i$, and $d_i = 2i$. The Nash equilibrium is $(2, -4, 6, 3, 1)$.

The undirected and connected communication graph for the players is given in Fig. 1. Furthermore, in the simulation $a_{ij} = 1$ if player i is connected to player j.

The simulation results produced by the method proposed in Theorem 4 are shown in Figs. 2-4. Fig. 2 shows the updating of y_{ij} which converges to $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{ij}x_{jj}$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. Fig. 3 shows the updating of z_{ij} which converges to $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_{ij}$ for $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$. The updating of $l_{ii}(t), i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ which converges to the Nash equilibrium point is shown in Fig. 4.



Fig. 2: The plot of $y_{ij}(t)$, $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ produced by (39) and (23b)-(23e).



Fig. 3: The plot of $z_{ij}(t)$, $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ produced by (39) and (23b)-(23e).

Define the error signal as

$$e_i(t) = x_i^* - l_{ii}(t), i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}.$$

The plot of the error signals is shown in Fig. 5.

From the results, it can be seen that the estimated actions converge to the Nash equilibrium.

VI. Conclusion

Distributed Nash equilibrium seeking for a network of players is studied in this paper. Based on an average consensus protocol, Nash seeking schemes are designed. For general non-cooperative games, local convergence to the Nash equilibrium is proven under mild conditions. Potential games are studied


Estimation on the Nash equilibrium strategy of player 1
Estimation on the Nash equilibrium strategy of player 2
Estimation on the Nash equilibrium strategy of player 3
Estimation on the Nash equilibrium strategy of player 4
Estimation on the Nash equilibrium strategy of player 5
Time (Seconds)

Fig. 4: The plot of the estimations on the Nash equilibrium $l_{ii}(t)$, $i \in \{1,2,3,4,5\}$ produced by (39) and (23b)-(23e).



Fig. 5: The plot of the estimation errors $e_i(t)$, $i \in \{1,2,3,4,5\}$.

as a special case. Singular perturbation analysis is utilized in the closed-loop system analysis. For quadratic games, it is proven that under the proposed updating strategy, the Nash equilibrium is globally exponentially stable.

REFERENCES

[1] P. Frihauf, M. Krstic and T. Basar, "Nash equilibrium seeking in non-coopearive games," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 57, pp. 1192-1207, 2012.

[2] D. Pozo and J.Contreras, "Finding multiple Nash equilibria in pool-based markets: a stochastic EPEC approach," *IEEE Transactions on Power System*, Vol. 26, No. 3, pp. 1744-1752, 2011.

[3] L. Raltiff, S. Burden and S. Sastry, "Characterization and computation of local Nash equilibria in continuous games," *Fifty-first Annual Allerton Conference*, pp. 917-924, 2013.

[4] K. Vamvoudakis, F. Lewis and G. Hudas, "Multi-agent differential graphical games: online adaptive learning solution for synchronization with optimality," *Automatica*, Vol. 48, pp. 1598-1611, 2012.

[5] J. Poveda, A. Teel and D. Nesic, "Flexible Nash seeking using stochastic difference inclusion," *American Control Conference*, pp. 2236-2241, 2015.

[6] N. Li and J. Marden, "Decoupling coupled constraints through utility design," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 59, No. 8, pp. 2289-2294, 2014.

[7] B. Ghaersifard and J. Cortes, "Distributed convergence to Nash equilibria in two-network zero-sum games," *Automatica* Vol. 49, pp. 1683-1692, 2013.

[8] Y. Lou, Y. Hong, L. Xie, G. Shi, and K. H. Johansson, "Nash equilibrium computation in subnetwork zero-sum games with switching communications," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 61, 2016.

[9] M. Zhu and E. Frazzoli. "On distributed equilibrium seeking for generalized convex games". *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 4858-4863, 2012.

[10] M. Zhu and E. Frazzoli, "Distributed robust adaptive equilibrium computation for generalized convex games," http://arxiv.org/abs/1507.01530.

[11] D. Schiro, J. Pang and U. Shanbhag, "On the solution of affine generalized Nash equilibrium problems with shared constraints by Lemke's method," *Math. Program.*, Ser. A, Vol. 142, pp. 1-46, 2013.

[12] M. Stankovi, K. Johansson and D. Stipanovi, "Distributed seeking of Nash equilibria with applications to mobile sensor networks," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, Vol. 57, No. 4, pp. 904-919, 2012.

[13] S. Liu and M. Krstic, "Stochastic Nash equilibrium seeking for games with general nonlinear payoffs, *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, Vol. 49, No. 4, pp. 1659C1679, 2011.

[14] J. I. Poveda and N. Quijano, "Shahshahani gradient-like extremum seeking control," *Automatica*, Vol. 58, pp. 51-59, 2015.

[15] H. Durr, M. Stankovic, C. Ebenbauer and K. Johansson, "Lie bracket approximation of extremum seeking systems," *Automatica*, Vol. 49, pp. 1438-1552, 2013.

[16] F. Salehisadaghiani and L. Pavel, "Nash equilibrium seeking by a gossip-based algorithm," *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 1155-1160, 2014.

[17] A. Mohsenian-Rad, V. Wong, J. Jatskevich, R. Schober and A. Garcia, "Autonomous demand-side management based on game-theoretic energy consumption scheduling for the future smart grid," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 320-331, 2010.

[18] E. Nekouei, T. Alpcan and D. Chattopadhyay, "Game-theoretic frameworks for demand response in electricity markets," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 748-758, 2015.

[19] J. Koshal, A. Nedic and U. Shanbhag, "A gossip algorithm for aggregative games on graphs," *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 4840-4845, 2012.

[20] M. Ye and G. Hu, "Game design and analysis for price-based demand response: an aggregate game approach," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, accepted, to appear.

[21] G. Arslan and J. Shamma, "Distributed convergence to Nash Equilibria with local utility measurements," *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 1538-1543, 2004.

[22] M. Ye and G. Hu, "A distributed extremum seeking scheme for networked optimization," *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 4928-4933, 2015.

[23] M. Ye and G. Hu, "Distributed extremum seeking for constrained networked optimization and its application to energy consumption control in smart grid," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, accepted, to appear, DOI. 10.1109/TCST.2016.2517574.

[24] D. Monderer and L. Shapley, "Potential games," *Games and Economic Behavior*, Vol. 14, pp. 124-143, 1996.

[25] J. Nash, "Non-cooperative games," Ann. Math., Vol. 54, pp. 286-295, 1951.

[26] F. Lewis, H. Zhang, K. Hengster-Movric and A. Das, Cooperative Control of Multi-Agent Systems: Optimal and Adaptive Design Approaches, Springer-Verlag, 2014.

[27] R. Freeman, P. Yang and K. Lynch, "Stability and convergence properties of dynamic average consensus estimators," *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 398-403, 2006.

[28] A. Menon and J. Baras, "Collaborative extremum seeking for welfare optimization," *IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 346-351, 2014.

[29] H. Khalil, Nonlinear System, Prentice Hall, 3rd edtion, 2002.

[30] R. Horn and C. Johnson, Matrix Analysis, Cambridge, U.K.:Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985.